

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

*February 18-19, 2004
Best Western Beachfront Inn
Brookings, Oregon*

FINAL MINUTES

February 18, 2004

Membership Attendance:

California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry	Dave Bitts
California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)	Not represented
California In-River Sport Fishing Community	Not represented
Del Norte County	Chuck Blackburn
Hoopa Valley Tribe	Not represented
Humboldt County	Jill Geist
Karuk Tribe	Ron Reed
Klamath County	Steve West, Vice Chair
Klamath Tribes	Allen Foreman
National Marine Fisheries Association (NOAA Fisheries)	Irma Lagomarsino
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)	Keith Wilkinson
Siskiyou County	Marcia Armstrong
Trinity County	Not represented
U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)	Al Olson
U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI)	John Engbring, Chair
Yurok Tribe	Dave Hillemeier

Agendum 1. Convene and opening remarks

John Engbring opened the meeting stating there is renewed attention directed at the Klamath Basin from California and Oregon states as well as from the Federal government. He said there had recently been a meeting between the two states, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), tribes, and irrigators, to focus on actions needed in the basin. Years ago, he said, this meeting would not have happened.

Steve West said that he agrees with John Engbring's statement that progress is being made in the Basin. He added that the infrastructure is now lined up for success. This is, however, a cautious optimism. He announced that there is a watershed conference next week in Klamath Falls that will provide a good opportunity for people to get together to continue to develop solutions. Additionally, the USGS held a science workshop last week that opened up some good dialogue. Keith Wilkinson stated that he shares Steve's optimism and hopes that the fishing community could be involved in future meetings.

Agendum 2. Business

a. Approval of minutes

No corrections of the minutes were requested.

**Motion: Motion by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the draft minutes for the October meeting.
Second by Chuck Blackburn.
Motion passed unanimously.**

b. Adoption of Agenda

Changes to the agenda were regarding Agendum 5, with the addition of item d: to discuss last week's Klamath Upper Basin Science Workshop in more detail. Agendum 7 was cancelled because Sue Ellen Wooldridge, Department of the Interior, could not be in attendance. A report from Klamath Fishery Management Council (KFMC) will be inserted as a new Agendum 7.

**Motion: Motion by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the amended agenda.
Second by Dave Bitts.
Motion passed unanimously.**

c. Potential joint meeting with Trinity Management Council

The desire to have a joint meeting with the Trinity Management Council had been discussed at prior meetings. John Engbring discussed this with Doug Schleusner and found overlap with this Task Force's June meeting and the next Trinity Management Council meeting, concluding that a joint meeting in June will not be possible.

Keith Wilkinson added that he was a long-time supporter of joint meetings, but now wonders about the productivity of a joint meeting. He said he would be interested in a joint presentation opportunity though. John Engbring said that he will contact the TMC to see what key issues they can present to the Klamath Fisheries Basin Task Force. Chuck Blackburn said that he concurs with Keith Wilkinson, but does think an opportunity for interaction between the groups creates a healthy situation.

Assignment: John Engbring will contact Doug Schleusner to ask him to make a presentation at an upcoming meeting on Trinity Management Council activities.

d. Action on proposal to require that all handouts include date, author, and authority under which they are submitted

John Engbring said that he does not think this agenda item requires any discussion since it seems fairly straight forward. He concluded that in the future, any person wishing to speak from the outside must first provide contact information.

Agendum 3. Introduction of Congressional staff in attendance

There were no members of Congressional staff in attendance.

Agendum 4. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update

Laurie Simons introduced herself and said that she typically reviews the motions and assignments from the previous meeting. She then reviewed the motions and assignments.

Laurie Simons reviewed the Agendum 4 handouts for the meeting. Dave Hillemeier asked if the Task Force funding of CDFG's hatchery tagging is something new. Phil Detrich responded that the Task Force

will purchase the tags for them with funds that were not spent for a project that was completed with other funds (98-HP-07). Dave disagreed with the use of Task Force funding and suggested that PacifiCorp or CDFG come to the next meeting to talk about the hatchery tagging work planned for next year.

Assignment: Staff will invite PacifiCorp and the California Department of Fish and Game to the next Task Force meeting to discuss plans to fund tagging and mitigation numbers for the Iron Gate Fish Hatchery.

Keith Wilkinson stated that he recently heard that the California economic situation has worsened and the staff cannot travel out of state. He then asked to see some clarification about the responsibility of tagging as it relates to the reauthorization of the PacifiCorp project. John Engbring suggested the group hear from PacifiCorp about the tagging and future of the hatchery. He added that he is willing to speak with the CDFG to see if they are able to travel over the state line to attend meetings.

Assignment: John Engbring will talk with the California Department of Fish and Game about their travel restrictions for the June meeting and consider writing a letter, if needed.

Dave Hillemeier agreed that PacifiCorp should attend the next meeting since they fund the hatchery. He concluded stating that he is concerned how PacifiCorp and CDFG plan to conduct hatchery tagging. Dave Bitts reminded the Task Force that management of ocean fisheries depends on proper tagging of hatchery fish.

Phil Detrich said that occasionally modifications to funding of individual projects does occur. He said while realizing the money was almost lost to the program, they received a request from CDFG to fund the hatchery tagging. He added that he worked with the BIA to ensure the money would not be lost, but also to be sure it was properly applied to the program.

Ronnie Pierce announced to the group that the PacifiCorp project final license application (FLA) is about to be submitted. She reminded the group the FLA comments are due prior to the June Task Force meeting. Dave Hillemeier said that he realizes the agenda has been approved, but asked to amend the agenda to allow for discussion of the FERC relicensing process. The topic was added to Agendum 7.

Laurie Simons then announced that the annual report is available.

Agendum 5. Brief updates and announcements

a. Update on State recovery process

Phil Detrich announced that since CDFG is absent, he would brief the group. He provided the news release announcing Fish and Game Commission approval of the recovery strategy. They will proceed with the listing of the coho. He suggested contacting the Redding CDFG office if an individual requires additional information.

b. Update on NOAA recovery planning

Irma Lagomarsino stated that the Federal Recovery Team is close to releasing a draft document that identifies the individual populations. The next step is to examine population viability through a Phase I viability analysis.

c. Status of lamprey petition

Phil Detrich read a letter dated February 10, 2004 from the Portland FWS office that stated the Service is unable to review the lamprey petition this fiscal year due to funding constraints. The letter read that the Fish and Wildlife Service would review the lamprey petition when funding allows.

d. USGS Upper Klamath Basin Science Workshop

Dan Fritz said the USGS holds annual meetings each year to discuss the state of affairs on Klamath science. He added that the meetings are typically attended by 40-50 fishery scientists, but since the 2001 NAS report emergence that number has grown exponentially. He added that he was a member of the planning committee and there were more than 200 people registered for the workshop. He said he has heard quite a bit of feedback requesting a similar type of workshop be organized for the lower basin. He added that following the workshop, a ballot has been circulated requesting that information be provided to agencies and universities to ensure that sound science is available and utilized in basin level work. The Task Force discussed their desire to support a Science Workshop in the Lower Basin and agreed on the following actions.

Motion: Motion by Steve West to approve funding of a lower basin science workshop up to 25% of cost but not to exceed \$10K.

Second by Dave Bitts.

Motion passed unanimously.

Assignment: Irma Lagomarsino and Dave Hillemeier to form subcommittee to identify resources for help in planning a lower basin science workshop. John Engbring will talk with USGS to see if they would be interested in participating in the workshop.

Agendum 6. Updates on anadromous fishery restoration efforts

John Engbring provided a handout that lists all of the restoration projects that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) funded within the Klamath River Basin in 2003 (see Agendum 4 handout). John Engbring stated that the handout includes all of the funding resources that come into the USFWS and emphasized the need for transparency concerning project funding. He said it would help to highlight and document accomplishments.

Al Olson presented a handout that summarizes Forest Service restoration efforts in the Klamath Basin. Al Olson commented that the focus of his document is “on the ground” accomplishments, and it includes an itemized list capturing accomplishments in bullet form. He added that he wants to emphasize the importance of partnerships.

Dave Hillemeier asked if permit funding has been waived. He said lately permitting has become a headache, causing delays in project implementation processes by up to a year. John Engbring asked if there has been funding allocated for restoration work on private lands. Dave Hillemeier responded that they have hired a consultant for the sole purpose of processing the permitting applications since it has become so complex. Laurie Simons responded that the state can streamline Clean Water Act Section 404 and 401 requirements and the Fish and Wildlife Service can streamline the Endangered Species Act requirements. Projects funded by both the state and the USFWS work best.

Ron Reed said that last year the Karuks had a team help to restore approximately ten miles of road. This year they are trying to do about the same distance on Irving Creek watershed, but lack of funding is the obstacle. He added that it requires roughly \$385,000 a year to fund one maintenance team. He added that they typically work closely with the USFS, and right now are working on a stream assessment project. They have identified twelve sites and have conducted a feasibility study for them. They are now working on an RFP to try and get fish up above the barriers. They are also working on fuels management and are trying to coordinate with other groups in the basin to prioritize problems.

Marcia Armstrong stressed that the regulations could make an individual land owner's project non-viable. She suggested creating a template that private landowners check off to describe their mitigations.

Keith Wilkinson asked if there is a general road work strategy. Al Olson responded that there is a strategy, but the first aspect is simply figuring out which part of the road needs the most work. He added that storm proofing receives a high priority and offers a high return on investment. Typically that work includes bringing an older road up to modern design, ensuring that it is safely designed for travel, is out-sloped, and contains a rock running surface. Most roads are 40-50 years old, culverts fail, and the budgets aren't structured to deal with all infrastructure costs.

Steve West commented that he was surprised that there isn't any mention of county funds being given to BLM and USFS (Resource Advisory Committee). He added that county funds are discretionary and do not need to be given away. He said they do not have to remind the BLM where that money has come from, but they do have to regularly remind the USFS. Klamath County has contributed approximately \$3M which is the second highest in the nation.

Dave Hillemeier said that some lower basin restoration work includes removal of log dams and barriers. Some have been successful; they're easy and provide a quick return on investment. We have also identified barriers, planted riparian zones, rehabilitated logging roads, conducted watershed assessments and temperature monitoring, assessed regional coho abundance, and conducted radio tracking of Chinook salmon.

Agendum 7. Progress of Klamath Basin Federal Working Group

John Engbring said that Sue Ellen is not here, but added that he knows the group is working on a document that has not yet been finalized. Steve West said that Commissioner Keys submitted an Op-Ed piece to the Klamath Falls newspaper, the *Herald and News*.

John Engbring said he wanted to add two other items to the agenda: 7a. KFMC Report and 7b. Klamath Project Relicensing.

a. KFMC Report

Phil Detrich said that during the October Task Force meeting, the group talked about Congress considering not funding KFMC for 2004. Subsequently, Congress decided to fund KFMC, but due to uncertainty, they missed their October meeting. He said that at the conference next week, the KFMC will make a presentation about the harvest management of Klamath stocks.

b. Klamath Project Relicensing

The Klamath Hydroelectric Project Final License Application (FLA) will be out for review and comment shortly. Dave Hillemeier stated that given the importance of the dams and their impacts on the fisheries,

it would make sense that the Task Force comment on the FLA. Marcia Armstrong said that she understands the duty of the Task Force is to act as an advisory body and not to make comments. John Engbring added that he said they would be making comments to the Secretary and therefore they would be advising.

Laurie Simons read four functions of the Task Force from the Klamath Act, basically: 1) assisting the Secretary, 2) assist and coordinate activities with other projects in area, 3) conduct any activity necessary to accomplish goals, and 4) act as an advisor. The third charge has been interpreted fairly broadly, including commenting.

Marcia Armstrong said she cannot commit to making comments in her capacity as a public official. Steve West said he respectfully disagrees and added that he represents Klamath County on this Task Force and any statements he makes are not for the board of supervisors. He said he views it more as he has a responsibility to comment.

Marcia Armstrong responded that her role is a board assignment. Dave Hillemeier said it seems like a fundamental issue on the Task Force. Dave Bitts said he understands that each county has a stake in the Task Force's activities and it is the responsibility of the Task Force to see that each county is comfortable with the outcomes. John Engbring said the Task Force is a technical advisory group, and therefore deals with the science, and does not overlap into the political arena. His responsibility as the chair is to restore the fishery and they can prepare comments that speak to the options for restoring salmon. He added that logistically, preparing comments within this group would be tough, but they could put together some generic comments.

Steve West said it is pretty obvious that relicensing processes do not happen very often and he hopes that this group can utilize that process to its fullest extent. He added that they have a window of opportunity to decide how that river will be managed for another 50 years and he hopes that we can use this process to accomplish as much as we can for the overall health of the river and its well being.

Chuck Blackburn said they have the opportunity to take this information back to individual groups, but as a board member, we are given the task of working on day-to-day activities and also to work on extraordinary activities such as the FERC process. He said they can cover all bases and still conduct business. He added that they have an obligation to comment.

Dave Hillemeier said he agrees that logistically commenting on the full license application is not possible, but he does think the Task Force should focus comments on specific highlights. He added that the license application should include a broad range of alternatives.

Marcia Armstrong said Jim DePree has been active in the FERC relicensing process for Siskiyou County. She stated that she is concerned that with her limited knowledge of the process, she may make comments that do not align with his.

Steve West asked if the technical working group can respond. John Engbring commented that his sense is that comments are an area where the Task Force has oversight, but on a key issue like the FERC relicensing process, they would want to see it before it goes out.

Ron Reed said Karuk ancestral territory involves two states and five counties. He added that their lifestyle and integrity has been impacted by the dams. Dave Hillemeier asked Petey Brucker for his comments on the license application comments. Petey Brucker responded that if the comments involve too much detail, it would be difficult to reach consensus on them. He said the technical group already feels stretched with its current workload and he is concerned with the level of detail that may be involved in preparing FERC

comments. He added that if the Task Force is talking about a two page letter then they could help put them together.

John Engbring said that once the FLA comes out, the Task Force will revisit the two-page comment letter and see if the concept still makes sense.

Phil Detrich added that the comment letter will need to be prepared within a 60 day timeframe. He suggested assigning a subgroup to complete the task of preparing the comment letter.

Assignment: Yurok Tribe, Siskiyou County, and Peter Brucker to form a subcommittee to draft a 2-page comment letter in response to PacifiCorp's Final License Application. The letter will be distributed to the Task Force for approval. Once the letter is approved, it will be sent to FERC, Secretary of the Interior, and PacifiCorp.

Agendum 8. Public Comment

Jim Henderson, Karuk Tribe, clarified that as part of the PacifiCorp Klamath hydro project there are six dams up for relicensing and any combination of them can be considered for removal.

Tim McKay, Director of the North Coast Environmental Center in Arcata, California said he wanted to thank the group for all its hard work. He said he came to see Sue Ellen Wooldridge speak, but added that the environmental community has provided for county contributions to complete activities. And as an active observer of these activities, he feels that credit is not always given where credit is due. He said that when groups such as his own petitioned for the listing of the coho, in effect it sends contributions to the Task Force. He, in return, asked that members of the Task Force support their efforts too when the time is right. He also requested that the Task Force consider more California meetings.

Robert Donahue, Atlantic States Legal Foundation, recommended that the advisory board, as part of the FERC process, consider a social impact study in the Lower Basin. He said it would help develop consensus among counties and different groups.

Agendum 9. Report from Klamath Watershed Coordination Group

a. Klamath Basin Compact Commission

Alice Kilham said they have been supportive of funding the upcoming conference and added that she has been working to organize the web page. She encouraged people to review it at www.klamathgroup.org adding that there will be several links to reports and other sites and should be viewed as a one-stop shopping site. The committee for the conference will be meeting on Tuesday the 23rd at 4 pm. John Engbring asked who is on the coordination group. Alice Kilham responded that Dave Hillemeier, Neil Manji and Steve West have joined in the Upper Basin and Mike Orcutt from the Trinity has also helped out. She also expressed an overall need for an oversight committee to play a part in upcoming decisions.

b. Upper Klamath Basin Working Group

Jim Carpenter said he wants to applaud Alice Kilham's efforts at leading the coordination of the website. He said it is a great resource and tool that the basin should utilize more. He added that the Hatfield group has been focusing on funding and reauthorization issues. He said they have been meeting monthly, but have been lacking full participation lately because so much activity has been going on in the upper basin.

He said people have probably heard of the secret meetings in the upper basin that have involved the tribes and irrigation districts. He said they are looking at a basin wide assessment, working from Iron Gate on up to set some restoration priorities.

c. Trinity Management Council

Irma Lagomarsino said that the council decided to convene a subcommittee to conduct a self assessment with regard to progress. Dave Hillemeier said that some individuals have a need to look at progress as far as adaptive management and determining how to best meet the regional flows. Irma Lagomarsino announced that they have awarded contracts to construct two bridges that are needed to allow higher flows.

Agendum 10. Report from Technical Work Group

Petey Brucker said the Technical Work Group (TWG) met in December and conducted a review of the sub-basin plans and various restoration activities. He added that the Scott River group has completed their plan; the Salmon River plan is complete and is being implemented. There is no information from Dave Webb of SSRT for the Shasta River. Currently, he said, they are determining how to get information regarding Spring Chinook. The redrafted action plan for the middle Klamath sub-basin will be going out for review in March. The lower Klamath sub-basin has also completed their plan and a more detailed update will be provided in June.

Petey Brucker said that there is so much work going on in the mainstem of the Klamath, there is a need for these activities to be coordinated. There needs to be a mainstem sub-basin plan but the TWG does not have time to do it. For example, the NRC report has a lot of recommendations but doesn't indicate how to apply them. Laurie Simons said she spoke to the NRC coordinator and asked if they would be interested and available to present their report with the Task Force, but they have yet to respond.

Petey Brucker added that he also wanted to clarify that the TWG is not a consensus group. They work with differences of opinion, and only send comment letters when asked to.

Steve West said that Petey Brucker's presentation has re-enforced the need for a lower basin workshop. Irma Lagomarsino said they need to evaluate research methodologies so that when results are presented they can better understand them. She added that she supports the idea of a lower basin workshop.

Agendum 11. Report from Budget Committee

a. Final FY 2004 Budget

Phil Detrich said the Budget Committee had a conference call in November 2003 to discuss the budget. The budget for fiscal year 2004 was reviewed (see Agendum 11 handout). He said Table 1 and Table 2, attached to the handout, are the budgets for fiscal year 2003. Table 3 and Table 4 describe the 2004 budget allocations approved last June.

b. Proposed FY 2005 Budget

The Budget Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2005 (Tables 5 and 6 of Agendum 11 handout) has three basic items: 1) project funding would be decreased and admin would be increased by \$20,000 in the 2005 budget, 2) Task Force discussion of reauthorization of the Klamath act, which expires in 31

months, and 3) Task Force should consider setting aside funding for the preparation of an Accomplishment Report.

Phil Detrich said that in November 2003, it would not be possible to continue on without more administration money based on required salary increases. After the November meeting, the Yreka office kept working on budget numbers and on reducing costs and found that we are able to return the restoration projects total to what it has been in past years (see revised Table 6).

Steve West said that he heard criticism of this group about its overhead costs. He said that he understands it, but the Task Force needs to better explain the needs for the overhead rate and provide an education so as to not receive further criticism. He said they need to better tell the story of what that 42 percent for administration costs includes. It is different with a Federal advisory group. We have NEPA, FACA, ESA reporting requirements that we have to meet.

Irma Lagomarsino said she thinks there might come a time when the Task Force spends more on administration than on restoration and when that time comes, she will question if it is worth it. Steve West said he thinks it still comes down to how the story is told. He added that the people in DC likely do not know what it takes to do the NEPA process and the costs associated with administering the laws that they pass.

Motion: Motion by Keith Wilkinson to approve the fiscal year 2005 budget projections as shown in Table 6a.

Second by Steve West.

Motion passed unanimously.

c. Proposal to prepare a Klamath Act Accomplishments Report

Phil Detrich described the Budget Committee's proposal to have an Accomplishments Report prepared describing the projects that have been funded and the existing conditions of habitat and fisheries in each of the sub-basins. Summaries of projects funded by other sources would be included as well. He said he thinks the cost of such a report would be about \$50,000.

Keith Wilkinson said he thinks they all possess the information required for this report. But the question is how to organize it in a concise document. John Engbring said they need to determine who their audience is; will this be a five or 100 page document. Laurie Simons said that a short five page overview is being prepared for the June meeting by Petey Brucker, resulting from an earlier project. She added that they need to have this money set aside in the 2005 budget or 2006 if the group wants it, because the Task Force budget is uncertain after that.

Assignment: Staff to prepare an accomplishments report outline and two costing alternatives for preparing this type of document.

Agendum 12. Discussion of Klamath Act Reauthorization

John Engbring said the Budget Committee recommended this topic and put it on the agenda. He said as a federal agency, the USFWS implements the laws that congress passes, and will not favor any legislation. It is really the people who live in this basin who need to decide what happens here.

Keith Wilkinson said that in 1999 a management council subcommittee developed a profile of what the reauthorization would look like. He said they came up with an independent determination of their budget and it required roughly \$7M annually. He suggested that the group begin talking about reauthorization. We need to talk about the strategy to see our projects through to the end.

John Engbring said there is a lot of activity in the basin and the Task Force needs to determine how to best mesh the current work that is taking place. He said his perspective is that this forum provides people an opportunity to talk about what is happening around us. If this kind of forum goes away, he thinks organizations and agencies would revert back to finger pointing and litigation.

Dave Bitts said he thinks John Engbring summarized his point exactly. He added that it may not be the money that gets the job done, but because we are here, other groups may be able to go and get the funding to do good work. Chuck Blackburn said he has been a part of the Task Force for a while and thinks this group has grown in trust and faith.

Jill Geist said that the reauthorization of the Klamath Act is something this group needs to continue to support. She said they need to put together an accomplishments report to make available for folks to review.

Marcia Armstrong expressed concern about how to best integrate the individual viewpoints that she represents. She'd like to see better representation of other interests at the table. Dave Bitts said he thinks this group is about as large as it can get while still remaining functional, but he also agrees with Marcia's point that this group should have better representation from other interests in the basin.

The group discussed the idea of an over-arching Task Force for the entire basin. Chuck Blackburn asked whether the TF should regularly agendize presentations from the timber industry, farmers, fishers, etc, in order to hear their concerns. This will be further discussed at the next meeting.

Assignment: Keith Wilkinson, Marcia Armstrong, Steve West, Dave Hillemeier, and Jill Geist to form a subcommittee to re-visit questions concerning Klamath Act reauthorization and come to the June meeting prepared with a recommendation. It is also the charge of this subcommittee to address ways to better coordinate the upper and lower basins.

Agendum 13. Planning for 2004 Klamath Project Operations and the Conservation Implementation Program

Dan Fritz said that he found the discussion about the future role of this Task Force engaging. He said they held a meeting in November 2002 and at that time thought the Colorado program was a model for the Conservation Implementation Program (CIP), but they no longer think that. Since then, the Bureau has worked to refine and revise that plan. A revised document is being reviewed at the Department of the Interior and they expect to get comments back by the end of the month and will then distribute it for public comment. They have expanded the scope to include not only listed species, but other species of concern too. They have added language in the document that states recovery should lead to restoration and other things such as a sustainable economy and harvestable populations.

He said they have also changed the language to allow anyone to participate. He said they are in the process of getting a consultant on board to handle some facilitated work groups. He said they do not expect to call for comments until the second draft has gone through a series of workshops. He added that these have been structured to avoid any of the FACA requirements. He said the purpose of the CIP is to

restore the Klamath Lake ecosystem, contribute to restoration, maintain continued sustainable water management and contribute to tribal trust.

Dan Fritz said that the Klamath project operations key off of inflow into Upper Klamath Lake. River flows are in excess of 4100 cfs, and PacifiCorp is in an uncontrolled spill at Iron Gate right now. It looks like we are going to have a below average water year. We have been talking to interested parties this past week because they think that by the end of February the lake elevations would be below minimum requirements primarily due to inflows at Upper Klamath Lake. This storm that we just had has taken some of that pressure off, but it is still continuing. The inflows are quite significant today, but they will drop down again unless we get another storm event. There's a conference call on Friday to see where we are and we will have weekly, if not more often, calls to see how things will play out.

Assignment: Staff is to make sure the revised Bureau of Reclamation CIP document is distributed to all Task Force members.

Agendum 14. Public Comment

Ronnie Pierce, Klamath River Inter-Tribal Fish and Water Commission (KRITFWC), said that Dan Fritz spent a lot of time discussing the lake levels but he never said anything about meeting river flow levels. She said the plan was previously to hold flows at 1300 cfs when the biological opinion calls for 1900 plus. Regarding the \$50K in excess funds allocated to CDFG for tagging, Ronnie Pierce said the Task Force funds should not be used to maintain status quo. It is supposed to be used for restoration and protection of the fisheries.

Robert Donahue, Atlantic States Legal Foundation, said he thinks some of the upcoming processes require that the Task Force look at a possible role of working with the different restoration groups to find out what can be done to extend funding.

February 19, 2004

Changes in Attendance: All attendees remained present.

John Engbring opened the day stating that there are a few items left on the agenda that he'd like to discuss if time allows including the Lower Basin Science Workshop and the accomplishments report.

With regard to the Lower Basin Science Workshop, Steve West said he thinks it is too important to wait six months before putting it together. He said they can talk to Upper Basin Science Workshop organizers to get advice to help plan it. He said there is energy in the basin now that should be utilized. Jill Geist said she sees funding and attendance as impediments to moving forward with the Lower Basin Workshop. John Engbring suggested that they look at who will have the time and energy to pull it all together. He recommended that a subcommittee be formed to put effort toward organizing the Lower Basin Science Workshop.

Ronnie Pierce said that her experience organizing previous conferences has proven that six months organization time is not unreasonable.

Agendum 15. Task Force review recommendations from Mid-Term Evaluation Oversight Committee

a. Report on how to revise the Long Range Plan

Ronnie Pierce suggested and the Task Force concurred that staff and she could prepare addendum sheets to update the Long Range Plan from the mid-Term Evaluation recommendations that the Task Force agreed upon. She said the Task Force has revised every chapter that has a category of action. Ronnie Pierce said she understands the Long Range Plan is on the web so the web would need to be updated also.

Assignment: Staff will prepare addendum sheets for Long Range Plan from Mid-term Evaluation revisions that were approved by the Task Force, and provide an update on this at the June meeting.

b. Discussion of recommendation 2.F.4 from the Long Range Plan

The Task Force has made decisions on all of the recommendations from the mid-term evaluation except for 2.F.4 in the Long Range Plan. Ronnie Pierce said the Task Force discussed 2.F.4 at length during the last meeting, but we have not reached consensus on what to do and how to move forward.

John Engbring said he's willing to entertain edits to 2.F.4. Marcia Armstrong said she suggests that we delete the language 2.F.4 because it has a confrontational tone. She said she has received some correspondence from Gary Black, showing adequate progress made by the Scott Group, and he has a report available for folks if we want to see it.

Motion by Steve West to delete 2.F.4 from the Long Range Plan.

Second by Marcia Armstrong.

Dave Hillemeier, Keith Wilkinson and Dave Bitts abstained.

Motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 16. Klamath Provincial Advisory Committee - what it is and current issues

Al Olson said the Provincial Advisory Committees (PACs) came out of the Northwest Forest Plan in 1995 and were intended to encourage cooperation of various agencies and the local public. There are twelve PACs in Washington down to the Central Valley. The Klamath has its own PAC. PACs were formed for river basins. The steering committee of all the PACs includes involvement of eight agencies: BLM, FS, EPA, NPS, NOAA, NRCS, USFS, FWS, BIA. In the past the PAC has worked on a variety of issues, such as road impacts and assessments, but recently they have been looking at fire salvage fuels projects and wildland/river interfaces. They meet four times a year typically in Redding, CA. The DFO for the Klamath PAC is Peg Boland. The Klamath PAC currently needs representatives for tourism and recreation.

Steve West said for a number of years there has also been an Upper Basin subcommittee of the Klamath PAC and they have in the past looked at the Pelican Butte ski area proposal, and the proposed river plan that BLM is doing. They've come up with perhaps a new alternative instead of the one that BLM originally preferred.

Steve West said from his experience and constituency, the Klamath PAC has not been useful for Klamath County because it is just too big geographically. However, the Upper Klamath subcommittee has been useful.

Agendum 17. Presentation on the Initial Phase of the Scott River Watershed Council Strategic Action Plan

Rhonda Muse described the Scott River Watershed Council's Strategic Action Plan. They have completed a draft of their initial phase, and it is available for review. They have three more phases planned, which will update and expand the action plan in the next few years. The document is considered a living document.

Ronnie Pierce asked if habitat typing has been done for the whole basin. Rhonda Muse stated that it has not been done but they currently have a grant out to help with funding that effort.

Rhonda Muse said TMDLs are being incorporated and findings will be presented in March.

Rhonda Muse said the plans developed by the SSRT are linked to actions in our plan. Irma Lagomarsino said she sees potential redundancies and asked how parallel efforts will be coordinated. Rhonda Muse replied that from her perspective, the quarterly meeting updates will provide for this coordination.

Marcia Armstrong said one of the problems we are having in Siskiyou County is the regulatory efforts are going on while we are trying to also work on voluntary efforts. She said, "Access on private lands, including streambeds, generally requires landowner permission. This has been a problem when studies are being conducted by folks who work for a regulatory agency".

Agendum 18. Public Comment

Rick Costales, Chairman of the Scott River Watershed Council, thanked Rhonda Muse for doing a great job as a coordinator who could sort through all of this stuff and keep it all organized. He thanked the Task Force for helping us make hiring her a reality. No plan will be the same and each plan is a community - community effort.

Alice Kilham said she thinks it is exciting to see the sub-basin plans come together. She is on the Klamath PAC and one thing they did a few years back is form a socioeconomics committee. She added they were fairly influential in getting PacifiCorp to do an extensive study. She recommended that all sub-basin plans be placed on the Klamath Coordination Group website.

Ronnie Pierce said the subcommittee has not even gotten together to evaluate costs, it might be a cheap effort, but the way that Steve West put the motion out is we will still need to go out and beat the bushes for cash, even if we put it together for \$5K.

Petey Brucker said one of the problems in the Klamath area is that it is very diverse and it is really tough to get any one project moving. He recommended that the work be broken into zones.

Agendum 19. Natural Resources Conservation Service Farm Bill Appropriation for the Klamath River Basin - how it is being spent in the Upper and Lower Klamath River Basin areas and benefits for anadromous fish

Bill Gardiner, District Conservationist in Yreka, and Gene Kelley, District Conservationist in Tule Lake, presented information on the NRCS programs in the Klamath Basin. NRCS is part of the USDA and is involved with applied conservation of natural resources on private lands. Bill Gardiner said NRCS depends on voluntary participants, local partners, and is non-regulatory. There has to be an RCD to get a local NRCS office.

The 2002 Farm Bill set aside a \$50 million to be spent on water conservation in the Klamath Basin over 5 years. They have been funding improvements to irrigation systems, changing crops to conserve water, improvements of water storage, mitigation of drought effects and other measures. The Upper Basin has its own local advisory group, and the Scott and Shasta Valleys have an advisory group. In the Scott and Shasta, the advisory group has suggested that benefits for fish be considered when ranking projects, not just water conservation.

The Yreka NRCS office is assembling a planning team of 5 people to work over the next 5-10 years developing projects. They will be conducting assessments and recommending projects. There is no guarantee with these projects that water will be saved and left in the stream. This program alone is not going to take care of the fish. The community needs to keep talking and we will help.

Steve West said the Klamath Falls RCD is a great investment as it keeps the NRCS office here. Ron Reed said the Scott and Shasta rivers have historical and recent connections for the Karuk Tribe. Karuk Tribal members lived in the Scott River sub-basin historically, and currently in both sub-basins. The Karuk Tribe is interested in getting projects submitted for NRCS consideration.

Agendum 20. Presentation on the Fish and Wildlife Service Fish Die Off Report

This agendum was removed from the agenda because it is in the middle of litigation and they have been advised to not talk about it publicly because it may affect the lawsuit.

Agendum 21. Public Comment

Felice Pace, Klamath Forest Alliance volunteer, said he appreciates the effort of the NRCS and enjoyed their presentation. But he wants to point out that there were many folks that have interests in water management who did not have the opportunity to participate in coming up with water quality criteria. He added that he wants to be sure that the savings mentioned was not just paper water, but that it actually provides water to streams. Efficiency is different than conservation. It is only conservation if the farmer chooses to use it. The bottom line is that we will wait to see what savings is really being attained when we see the flow meter data. The criteria should be real water savings.

Agendum 22. Recap. Assignments and motions will be emailed within two weeks. Identify agenda to include in the next meeting.

Agendum 23. Future meetings are in Klamath Falls, June 23-24, 2004 and in Yreka, October 13-14, 2004.

Adjourn.

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

*February 18-19, 2004
Best Western Beachfront Inn
Brookings, Oregon*

FINAL AGENDA

February 18, 2004

1. Convene and opening remarks. John Engbring, Chair. Vice Chair is Steve West, Klamath County. Vice Chair for next meeting will be Allen Foreman, Klamath Tribes.
2. Business
 - a. Approval of minutes
 - b. Adoption of agenda
 - c. Potential joint meeting with Trinity Management Council
 - d. Action on proposal to require that all handouts include date, author, and authority under which they are submitted
3. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance
4. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update (Laurie Simons)
5. Brief Updates and Announcements
 - a. Update on State recovery process (Phil Detrich)
 - b. Update on NOAA recovery planning (Irma Lagomarsino)
 - c. Status of lamprey petition (Phil Detrich)
 - d. USGS Klamath Watershed Science Workshop
6. Updates on anadromous fishery restoration efforts (all members who wish to contribute)

Break

7. Reports
 - a. KFMC Report
 - b. Klamath Project Relicensing

8. Public Comment

Lunch

9. Report from Klamath Watershed Coordination Group
 - Klamath Basin Compact Commission (Alice Kilham)
 - Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (Jim Carpenter)
 - Trinity River Management Council (Mike Orcutt)

10. Report from Technical Work Group (Peter Brucker)

11. Report from Budget Committee (Phil Detrich)

- a. Final FY 2004 Budget
- b. Proposed FY 2005 Budget
- c. Proposal to prepare a Klamath Act Accomplishments Report

Break

12. Discussion of Klamath Act Reauthorization (Keith Wilkinson)

13. Planning for 2004 Klamath Project Operations and the Conservation Implementation Program (Dan Fritz, Bureau of Reclamation)

14. Public Comment

Recess

Social Hour – Join us in the Lounge across the street in the Smuggler's Cove restaurant.

February 19, 2004

15. Task Force review of recommendations from Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Committee

- a. Report on how to revise the Long Range Plan (Ronnie Pierce, Klamath Inter-tribal Fish and Water Commission and Laurie Simons, FWS)
- b. Discussion of recommendation 2.F.4 from the Long Range Plan

16. Klamath Provincial Advisory Committee – what it is and current issues (Peg Boland)

17. Presentation on the Initial Phase of the Scott River Watershed Council Strategic Action Plan (Rhonda Muse, Scott River Watershed Council Coordinator)

18. Public Comment

Break

19. Natural Resource Conservation Service Farm Bill Appropriation for the Klamath River Basin – how it is being spent in the Upper and Lower Klamath River Basin areas and benefits for anadromous fish (Bill Gardiner, NRCS)

20. Presentation on the Fish and Wildlife Service Fish Die Off Report (Phil Detrich, FWS)

21. Public Comment

22. Recap. Assignments and motions will be emailed in two weeks. Identify agenda to include in the next meeting. (John Engbring)

23. Future meetings are in Klamath Falls, June 23-24, 2004, and in Yreka, October 13-14, 2004

Adjourn

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

***February 18-19, 2004
Best Western Brookings Inn
Brookings, Oregon***

LIST OF HANDOUTS

- | | |
|------------|---|
| Agendum 4 | Letter to Dave Sabo, Area Manager, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation from John Engbring, Chairman, Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force, regarding Supplemental Notice of Intent to Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Operation of the Klamath Project, dated January 26, 2004. |
| Agendum 4 | Klamath Act Cost Accounting table from Yreka Fish & Wildlife Office, dated January 26, 2004. |
| Agendum 4 | List of Fish and Wildlife Service Restoration Projects Funded in the Klamath River Basin during Fiscal Year 2003. |
| Agendum 4 | List of Unspent or Incomplete Projects that are 3 years old or older. |
| Agendum 4 | Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Charter |
| Agendum 4 | Draft RFP, dated March 1, 2004. |
| Agendum 5a | Craig Martz - Fish and Game Commission Accept Coho Salmon Recovery Strategy and Proceeds with Listing Coho Salmon. |
| Agendum 6 | USDA Forest Service, R5 & R6 Annual Report: FY 03 Implementation of Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Measures in the Klamath River Basin, dated February 13, 2004. |
| Agendum 10 | Proposed Technical Work Group Agenda Upcoming March, 2004 Meeting in Yreka. |
| Agendum 10 | Salmon River Restoration Strategy – Action plan, dated February 18, 2004. |
| Agendum 10 | Spring-Run Chinook “National Research Council Report” Pages 230 and 231, dated February 18, 2004. |
| Agendum 10 | Technical Work Group Chairman’s Handout for February 2004 Klamath Task Force Meeting. |
| Agendum 11 | Memo to the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force and the Technical Work Group Members regarding November 2003 Budget Committee Meeting Recommendations, dated January 22, 2004. |
| Agendum 11 | Table 6a – Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program. Revised Klamath Act Projected Expenses for Fiscal Year 2005. |

Agendum 11c	Draft Outline of Proposed Klamath Task Force Accomplishments Report Yreka FWO, dated February 4, 2004.
Agendum 15a	Revision of the Long Range Plan, Review of Actions Taken Through October 23, 2003.
Agendum 15b	Handout for discussion on possible revision of recommendation 2.F.4 of the Long Range Plan.
Agendum 20	Klamath River Fish Die-off, September 2002 from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Report Number AFWO-F-02-03, dated November 7, 2003.
Informational	Letter to Secretary Gale Norton from John DeVoe, Executive Director, WaterWatch and Jim Waltman, Director, The Wilderness Society, regarding thoughts and suggestions on solutions for the Klamath Basin from the Klamath River Basin Federal Working Group.
Informational	Pamphlet – “Upper Klamath Basin Watershed Assessment – Seeking Common Ground...Using Common Sense.”
Informational	Klamath Basin Ecosystem Foundation Home Grown Annual Report, Volume 2, Issue 1, dated Winter 2004.
Informational	Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program Fiscal Year 2003 Annual Report.
Informational	Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Membership list, dated February 13, 2004.

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

*February 18 – 19, 2004
Best Western Brookings Inn
Brookings, Oregon*

LIST OF ATTENDEES

The following individuals attended the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force meeting in Brookings, Oregon, on the dates indicated:

February 18, 2004

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Dan Fritz	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Gene R. Kelley	U.S. Department of Agriculture
Jim Waldvogel	Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Technical Work Group
Angie Saltsman	Kearns & West
Tam Moore	Capital Press
Alice Kilham	Klamath Compact Commission
Curt Mullis	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Ronnie Pierce	Klamath Inter-Tribal Fish & Water Commission
Jim Welter	Port of Brookings Harbor
Earl Danosky	Tule Lake Irrigation District
Denver Nelson	Public
Tim McKay	Northcoast Environmental Center
Mike Long	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jerry Barnes	Public
Laura West	Public
Bill Gardiner	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Rick Costales	Scott River Watershed Council
John Carver	Public
Jim Henderson	Mid-Klamath Watershed Council
Toz Soto	Karuk Tribe
Jim & Stephanie Carpenter	Upper Klamath Basin Working Group
Rhonda Muse	Scott River Watershed Council

February 19, 2004

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Jim Waldvogel	Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Technical Work Group
Rhonda Muse	Scott River Watershed Council
Bill Gardiner	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Gene R. Kelly	U.S. Department of Agriculture
Ronnie Pierce	Klamath Inter-Tribal Fish & Water Commission
Jim Welter	Port of Brookings Harbor
Jack Armstrong	Public

February 19, 2004 cont.

Alice Kilham	Klamath Compact Commission
Ric Costales	Scott River Watershed Council
Jim Henderson	Mid-Klamath Watershed Council
Toz Soto	Karuk Tribe
Earl Danosky	Tule Lake Irrigation District
Curt Mullis	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Petey Brucker	Technical Work Group, Chair & Salmon River Restoration Council
Gary Curtis	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Mike Long	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Felice Pace	Volunteer for Klamath Forest Alliance & Yurok Tribe
Paul Kirk	Interested Party

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

*February 18-19, 2004
Best Western Beachfront Inn
Brookings, Oregon*

MOTIONS AND ASSIGNMENTS

Motions:

Agendum 2a

Motion proposed by Keith Wilkinson to approve the draft minutes for the October meeting.

Motion seconded by Chuck Blackburn.

Motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 2b

Motion proposed by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the amended agenda.

Motion seconded by Dave Bitts.

Motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 4

Motion proposed by Steve West to approve funding of a lower basin workshop up to 25% of cost, but not to exceed \$10,000.

Motion seconded by Dave Bitts.

Motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 11

Motion proposed by Keith Wilkinson to approve the fiscal year 2005 budget projection as shown in Table 6a.

Motion seconded by Steve West.

Motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 15

Motion proposed by Steve West to delete 2.F.4 from the Long Range Plan.

Motion seconded by Marcia Armstrong.

Dave Hillemeier, Keith Wilkinson and Dave Bitts abstained.

Motion passed unanimously.

Assignments:

Agendum 2c

John Engbring will contact Doug Schleusner to ask him to make a presentation at an upcoming meeting on Trinity Management Council activities.

Agendum 4

Staff will invite PacifiCorp and the California Department of Fish and Game to the next Task Force meeting to discuss plans to fund tagging and mitigation numbers for the Iron Gate Fish Hatchery.

John Engbring will talk with the California Department of Fish and Game about their travel restrictions for the June meeting and consider writing a letter, if needed.

Irma Lagomarsino and Dave Hillemeier to form subcommittee to identify resources for help in planning a lower basin science workshop. John Engbring will talk with USGS to see if they would be interested in participating in the workshop.

Agendum 7

Yurok Tribe, Siskiyou County, and Peter Brucker to form a subcommittee to draft a 2-page comment letter in response to PacifiCorp's Final License Application. The letter will be distributed to the Task Force for approval. Once the letter is approved, it will be sent to FERC, Secretary of the Interior, and PacifiCorp.

Agendum 11

Staff to prepare an accomplishments report outline and two costing alternatives for preparing this type of document.

Agendum 12

Chuck Blackburn asked that we discuss whether we should regularly agendize presentations from timber, farmers, fishers etc. to air their concerns.

Keith Wilkinson, Marcia Armstrong, Steve West, Dave Hillemeier, and Jill Geist to form a subcommittee to re-visit questions concerning the Klamath Act Reauthorization and come to the June meeting prepared with a recommendation. It is also the charge of this subcommittee to address ways to better coordinate the upper and lower basin.

Agendum 13

Staff is to make sure the revised Bureau of Reclamation CIP document is distributed to all Task Force members.

Agendum 15

Staff and Ronnie Pierce will prepare addendum sheets for Long Range Plan from Mid-term Evaluation revisions that were approved by the Task Force, and provide an update on this at the June meeting.